

By Mr. HAGERTY (for himself, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BAR-RASSO, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 26. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made to reporting of third party network transactions by the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S.J. Res. 1. A joint resolution proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States relative to the line item veto, a limitation on the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve, and requiring a vote of two-thirds of the membership of both Houses of Congress on any legislation raising or imposing new taxes or fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. VANCE, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S.J. Res. 2. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER:

S.J. Res. 3. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify the authority of Congress and the States to regulate corporations, limited liability companies, and other corporate entities established by the laws of any State, the United States, or any foreign state; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. MULLIN, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. Res. 10. A resolution memorializing the unborn by lowering the United States flag to half-staff on the 22nd day of January each year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HAGERTY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BUDD):

S. Res. 11. A resolution designating the week of January 22 through January 28, 2023, as "National School Choice Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 12. A resolution designating January 23, 2023, as "Maternal Health Awareness Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr.

MURPHY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 14. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the purchase of certain firearms by individuals under 21 years of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 25. A bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, today I rise to introduce two pieces of legislation, the Assault Weapons Ban and the Age 21 Act.

Assault weapons are weapons of war and they have no place on our streets. We have successfully banned assault weapons in the past, and it is long past time that we do it again.

Last year, our Nation suffered 648 mass shootings according to data from the Gun Violence Archive. That is nearly two mass shootings every day. An analysis by the Rockefeller Institute of Government found that mass shootings involving assault weapons resulted in an average of 2.3 more deaths and 4.4 more injuries than mass shootings that did not involve assault weapons.

Congress must do more to protect people from these deadly weapons.

The good news is, we have a solution that has been proven effective in the past: the Assault Weapons Ban.

I introduced the original Assault Weapons Ban that was signed into law in 1994. In the 10 years that the Assault Weapons Ban was in place, our country saw a 37-percent decline in gun massacres. In the decade after the Assault Weapons Ban expired, gun massacres shot back up by a stunning 183 percent.

There is no doubt that this bill would save lives. While the Assault Weapons Ban was in effect, gun massacres were down. After it expired, gun massacres rose.

We must once again pass the Assault Weapons Ban. I am pleased that so many of my Democratic colleagues have agreed to cosponsor this bill.

At the very least, Congress needs to take the important step of preventing individuals under the age of 21 from purchasing assault weapons. The Age 21 Act, which I am reintroducing today, would do just that.

Under current law, a firearms licensee may not sell or deliver a handgun to a buyer under the age of 21. However, this commonsense protection does not apply to assault weapon purchases. This loophole costs lives.

The Giffords Law Center, using FBI and census data, calculated that while 18- to 20-year-olds make up just 4 percent of the U.S. population, they commit 17 percent of all homicides.

So it makes sense that the law restricts individuals under the age of 21 from purchasing a handgun. But it does not make sense that this restriction does not extend to assault weapons as well. In the last 2 years, the shooter in three of the five deadliest mass shootings in the United States was a man under the age of 21.

If the Age 21 Act had been law last year, it could have stopped the 18-year-old who killed 10 people in Buffalo, NY, and the 18-year-old who killed 21 people in Uvalde, TX. These shooters used assault-style weapons that were legally purchased shortly after their 18th birthdays.

I thank the Senators who have stood with me in support of the Assault Weapons Ban and the Age 21 Act. I urge the rest of our colleagues to join us.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 21. A bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to modify the definition of the term "at-risk community"; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of the Community Wildfire Protection Act, bipartisan legislation that Senator DAINES and I are reintroducing today.

This bill would ensure that those communities that are deemed to be under the greatest threat from wildfire are eligible to receive existing Federal wildfire grants. This sounds obvious but unfortunately is not the case under current law.

The current definition of an "at-risk community" was codified in the 2003 Healthy Forest Restoration Act. That law requires that, in addition to experiencing significant wildfire risk, an eligible community must either be adjacent to Federal land or included on a list generated in 2001 consisting of voluntary input from States and Tribes.

Unfortunately, this 2001 list is far from objective or comprehensive. Communities on the list were not added based on an objective evaluation of their wildfire risk or threat to life and property, only whether an individual Governor or Tribal leader decided to add them. To make matters worse, there are obvious omissions from the list that show its inadequacy, and in fact, 19 States and territories never submitted a single community.

For example, large California cities such as Fresno, Fairfield, and Napa are not encompassed by this definition, all of which have experienced recent major wildfires. The list also omits Grizzly Flats, CA, which was devastated by the 2021 Caldor Fire, despite its proximity to Federal lands, as well as countless other small towns at great risk of wildfire.

These small, rural towns are frequently at the highest risk of wildfire and lack the resources to undertake wildfire resiliency projects on their own. Obviously, these are some of the towns that would most benefit from additional Federal help but because of the outdated definition, may not be eligible.

Aligning the definition in law for at-risk communities to today's environmental realities is more important than ever given the increased spread, frequency, and destructiveness of wildfires, especially in the West.

Our bill would simply end the practice of making Federal grants contingent on this outdated, incomplete list or proximity to Federal lands. Instead, our legislation would allow communities to be eligible based on the most up-to-date quantitative wildfire risk data for the entire United States—data already maintained by the U.S. Forest Service.

The 2021 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act provided \$1 billion for community wildfire resilience grants, and last year's Inflation Reduction Act included an historic \$1.8 billion for wildfire resilience on federal forestlands. Congress has done the work of providing funding for wildfire resilience. Now it must ensure that these projects can be targeted where they are most necessary and completed with the swiftness that the wildfire crisis demands.

I am pleased to work with Senator DAINES on this commonsense bill that will save lives, save communities, and ensure that Federal dollars are spent as effectively as possible. This change would help more communities in our home States of California and Montana and others throughout the West access Federal grants to reduce hazardous fuels around their communities and utilize authorities to complete them in a timely fashion, thereby reducing the threat posed by wildfire.

I am proud that our bill has received the support of the National Association of Counties, Rural County Representatives of California, the National Association of State Foresters, the Pacific Forest Trust, and the California Fire Safe Council.

Our bill is simple, but it would correct a glaring oversight in current law and ensure that billions of dollars in wildfire resiliency funding are applied where they are most needed. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself,
Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WYDEN, Mr.

MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 22. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of California, Oregon, and Washington; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise today to introduce the West Coast Ocean Protection Act, legislation that would prohibit new oil or natural gas leases in federal waters off the coast of California, Oregon, and Washington.

I am pleased to be joined today by Senators PADILLA, WYDEN, MERKLEY, MURRAY, CANTWELL, MENENDEZ, BOOKER, MARKEY, and SANDERS in introducing this bill, which is critically important to protecting the west coast from additional oil spills.

Californians know all too well the devastating effects of oil spills. In 1969, a well blowout on an offshore rig spilled an estimated 3 million gallons of crude oil into the Pacific Ocean off the coast of Santa Barbara. At the time, it was the worst oil spill in U.S. history and was catastrophic to the local environment and marine life, closing beaches, harming the economy, and killing thousands of birds, fish, and marine mammals.

After the Santa Barbara disaster, California had enough. The State blocked all new offshore drilling in state waters and in 1994 enacted a permanent offshore drilling ban. Through local ordinances, congressional opposition, and Presidential moratoria, no new drilling in Federal waters off California has been allowed since 1984.

Unfortunately, Californians are still confronting the impacts from ongoing offshore drilling operations. In October 2021, a ruptured pipeline spilled more than 25,000 gallons of crude oil into the Pacific Ocean and onto the beaches of Orange County. Despite numerous alarms, operators allowed oil to flow from the leak for over 14 hours. It was absolutely devastating.

The spill covered more than 8,000 acres of the ocean's surface and required more than a week of cleanup. In that time, local businesses suffered, fisheries shuttered, and crews worked to remove harmful oil and tar balls from sensitive wildlife habitat.

Despite the harm caused to individuals and businesses in the community, the operator has been given permission to repair the pipeline and begin drilling again, exposing the California coastline to the risk of yet another accident.

California's coastal and ocean economies are engines of growth that support millions of jobs and generate significant economic activity for the State and Nation. Because of the unique nature of the west coast ocean shelf, any new potential drilling would occur near the coastline and directly threaten the environment and robust economy.

Beyond that, we are currently in the midst of a historic offshore energy transition. This past December, a successful auction was held for five offshore wind energy areas off the California coast, paving the way for a new floating wind industry. At the same time, the Federal Government has begun a programmatic review of decommissioning oil and gas platforms in the Pacific to prepare for their eventual removal. The era of offshore oil and gas production in the Pacific is coming to a close, and it is long overdue.

It is time to respect the view of California and our fellow west coast States by passing the West Coast Ocean Protection Act permanently ban offshore drilling and protect the Pacific coast for generations to come.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself,
Mr. PADILLA, Ms. KLOBUCHAR,
and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 24. A bill to fight homelessness in the United States by authorizing a grant program within the Health Resources and Services Administration for housing programs that offer comprehensive services and intensive case management for homeless individuals and families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise today to introduce the Fighting Homelessness Through Services and Housing Act, which would establish a new Federal grant program to increase capacity for comprehensive supportive services paired with housing as a way to address our country's homelessness crisis.

As we have seen with the growing diversity of our homeless populations—individuals with mental health conditions or those struggling with addiction, people who simply could not keep up with increases in rent, families with children, and veterans—our Nation's homelessness crisis is not going away on its own without coordinated efforts at every level of government.

According to the data released in December from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, there are approximately 582,500 homeless individuals, including families with small children, in the United States. Nearly 30 percent of this population is in California, with approximately 172,000 homeless people sleeping on the streets on any given night.

In a nation as prosperous and wealthy as ours, we can and we must do better to address the issue of homelessness.

That is why I am introducing the Fighting Homelessness Through Services and Housing Act, which would authorize a new Federal funding stream of \$1 billion per year, subject to annual appropriations. Grantees must serve individuals or families who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless by providing housing paired with a comprehensive set of services and must

provide a 25-percent match for any Federal funds received.

Because each individual and every community is unique, the grant program would be flexible in order to work in any region or for any homeless population.

This bill is based on a model that has proven to be effective and supports the great work already being done across the country, allowing local governmental entities and nonprofit organizations to expand their capacity and ensure a greater reach by putting Federal dollars where they will be most effective.

I am proud that this legislation is supported by a wide coalition of local governments, housing, health, and child welfare organizations, including the mayors and CEOs for U.S. Housing Investment, National League of Cities, National Alliance to End Homelessness, National Association of Counties, National Low Income Housing Coalition, and the National Housing Conference.

Supportive services such as mental and physical health care, substance abuse treatment, education and job training, and life skills such as financial literacy are critical components. Paired with intensive case management, supportive housing models make a difference.

We have seen the success of such partnerships in San Francisco, where the GLIDE Foundation provides critical services that meet an individual's basic needs, including meals, crisis intervention and prevention, childcare and educational programming, legal advice, and housing.

This would not be possible without the organization's partnerships with the city of San Francisco, particularly the San Francisco Department of Public Health, and other critical stakeholders. I highly encourage my colleagues to examine this exemplary homeless services model to see firsthand how effective partnerships can help to combat homelessness.

It is imperative that we support these types of partnerships, as well as nonprofit service providers, as they work to get people into housing to both mitigate the spread of the coronavirus and address their long-term needs.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the bill and moving it through the Senate, especially as we continue to contend with the increase in homelessness.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 10—MEMORIALIZING THE UNBORN BY LOWERING THE UNITED STATES FLAG TO HALF-STAFF ON THE 22ND DAY OF JANUARY EACH YEAR

Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. MULLIN, and Mrs. BLACKBURN) sub-

mitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 10

Whereas, on January 22, 1973, the majority of the members of the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that abortion was a right secured by the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas, on June 24, 2022, the majority of the members of the Supreme Court of the United States overturned *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), to affirm that the Constitution of the United States does not confer a right to abortion; and

Whereas, since January 22, 1973, more than 60,000,000 unborn children have perished: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the recognition of the Day of Tears in the United States on the 22nd day of January each year;

(2) encourages the people of the United States to lower their flags to half-staff to mourn and honor the innocents who have lost their lives to abortion; and

(3) encourages legislators to enact laws that respect the sanctity of life.

SENATE RESOLUTION 11—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF JANUARY 22 THROUGH JANUARY 28, 2023, AS "NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK"

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HAGERTY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BUDD) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 11

Whereas providing a diversity of choices in K-12 education empowers parents to select education environments that meet the individual needs and strengths of their children;

Whereas high-quality K-12 education environments of all varieties are available in the United States, including traditional public schools, public charter schools, public magnet schools, private schools, online academies, and home schooling;

Whereas talented teachers and school leaders in each of the education environments prepare children to achieve their dreams;

Whereas more families than ever before in the United States actively choose the best education for their children;

Whereas more public awareness of the issue of parental choice in education can inform additional families of the benefits of proactively choosing challenging, motivating, and effective education environments for their children;

Whereas the process by which parents choose schools for their children is non-political, nonpartisan, and deserves the utmost respect; and

Whereas tens of thousands of events are planned to celebrate the benefits of educational choice during the 13th annual National School Choice Week, held the week of January 22 through January 28, 2023: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of January 22 through January 28, 2023, as "National School Choice Week";

(2) congratulates students, parents, teachers, and school leaders from kindergarten through grade 12 education environments of all varieties for their persistence, achievements, dedication, and contributions to society in the United States;

(3) encourages all parents, during National School Choice Week, to learn more about the education options available to them; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to hold appropriate programs, events, and activities during National School Choice Week to raise public awareness of the benefits of opportunity in education.

SENATE RESOLUTION 12—DESIGNATING JANUARY 23, 2023, AS "MATERNAL HEALTH AWARENESS DAY"

Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 12

Whereas, each year in the United States, approximately 700 individuals die as a result of complications related to pregnancy and childbirth;

Whereas the pregnancy-related mortality ratio, defined as the number of pregnancy-related deaths per 100,000 live births, more than doubled in the United States between 1987 and 2017;

Whereas the United States is one of the only Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development member countries in which the maternal mortality rate has increased over the last several decades;

Whereas, of all pregnancy-related deaths in the United States between 2011 and 2016—

(1) nearly 32 percent occurred during pregnancy;

(2) approximately 35 percent occurred during childbirth or the week after childbirth; and

(3) 33 percent occurred between 1 week and 1 year postpartum;

Whereas more than 80 percent of maternal deaths in the United States are preventable;

Whereas, each year, more than 50,000 individuals in the United States suffer from a "near miss" or severe maternal morbidity, which includes potentially life-threatening complications that arise from labor and childbirth;

Whereas approximately 17 percent of individuals who give birth in a hospital in the United States report experiencing 1 or more types of mistreatment, such as—

(1) loss of autonomy;

(2) being shouted at, scolded, or threatened; or

(3) being ignored or refused or receiving no response to requests for help;

Whereas certain social determinants of health, including bias and racism, have a negative impact on maternal health outcomes;

Whereas significant disparities in maternal health outcomes exist in the United States, including that—

(1) Black individuals are more than 3 times as likely to die from a pregnancy-related cause as are White individuals;

(2) American Indian and Alaska Native individuals are more than twice as likely to die from a pregnancy-related cause as are White individuals;

(3) Black, American Indian, and Alaska Native individuals with at least some college education are more likely to die from a pregnancy-related cause than are individuals of all other racial and ethnic backgrounds with less than a high school diploma;

(4) Black, American Indian, and Alaska Native individuals are about twice as likely to